Fred Post 8/19/97

Misleading

It has been a long time but given the opportunity by his misuse and misrepresentation of the unspeakable sub humanity of the bombing of the Jerusalem marketplace, Roy Meachum again converted outrageous terrorism into his traditional attack on Israel. Which, only since Israel recovered all of Jerusalem, is again the holy land of free access to all religions.

The horrors inflicted in Israel by a small minority of Arabs was to have been ended by the Oslo accord, something Mr. Meachum never mentions in his "Killing begets more..." column.

In return for what it gave the Palestinians, Israel was to have been guaranteed peace and security. In addition, the organization Yassir Arafat headed was to remove from its charter the intent to drive all Jews into the seas.

Israel did not get the peace and security Arafat promised in the Oslo accord and nor did Arafat eliminate from that charter its firm determination to wipe out all Jews in the holy land.

Mr. Meachum quotes Egypt's Mubarak as saying Arafat is not "powerful enough." Then what good is his guarantee? His signature on anything? He is powerful enough to arrest known terrorists in his territory and he has been powerful enough to warn some terrorists to scram because Israel was about to nab them.

Mr. Meachum condemns what has been done in retaliation by Netanyahu, whose fan I am not. But he offers no alternative of any meaning in any effort to end that Arab terrorism — which Arabs can end if they ever decide to — instead of using terrorism to coerce Israel.

In condemning Israel's efforts to force the end of the endless terrorism against civilians, Mr. Meachum does not mention that this and other countries have done and are doing the same thing. Nor does he recall what non-Muslims have done to protect European Muslims.

He does not mention the planned bombing of the New York subways which, naturally, those who planned that awful atrocity blamed on Israel. Meachum has not written about that or about the bombing of the New York Trade Center. That was intended by the Arabs who did it to have that skyscraper collapse and kill thousands and thousands, mostly women.

In Mr. Meachum's usual contortion of reality he says that this effort to curb that kind of subhuman terrorism "obliged" the terrorists. What else would doing nothing have accomplished?

If Mr. Meachum were not so addicted to the authoritarian Arab countries he could understand that in a democratic society people can and do bring pressure on their government. Which would be the case if the land under Arafat's dictatorial control were democratic. Or if those people make the effort.

But do they dare? Do they not fear that then the terrorism would be against them? Do they not have reason to fear Arafat and what he would do?

Regardless of Mr. Meachum's contortions of both history and reality, the anti-Israeli terrorism is called for in the Palestinian chapter from which Arafat was to have eliminated it years ago. He even assured the Reagan administration that he had to be able to get into this country and be at the UN.

If as Mr. Meachum says, withholding moneys due is wrong for Israel, how does it become right and how has it been right for the United States for so many years during which it withheld what it owed the UN money to pressure it?

Never even-handed with Israel, Mr. Meachum quotes an Israel official as telling the *New York Times* that, "We are signaling the Palestinian authority that they will not be able to resume normal life until they take certain measures to combat terrorism."

According to Mr. Meachum this is wrong for Israel and right for all others ranging from Muslim dictatorships to the United States.

As with all he writes as the Arab partisan he has always been, which is his right, he withholds and misrepresents which is not his right.

That accomplishes nothing. It adds to prejudice and misleads people. Which in this and his earlier columns Meachum did, does and intends.

HAROLD WEISBERG
Frederick